

The Examiner states that these groups are distinct since the underlying inventions claimed are unrelated. In particular, the Examiner maintains that the method of treatment (Group II) involves totally different steps than the screening assay (Group I). Although the Examiner conjectures that other known inhibitors of MLK could be used in the claimed method of treatment, no specific examples of such other inhibitors have been provided.

Moreover, there is no indication that the relevant art for each group cannot be found in one location, or that non-coextensive searches may be required. Searching for these groups can be most effectively carried out together, thereby obviating the necessity for filing separate patent applications to cover the claims of each group. This would save considerable time and effort on the part of the USPTO. Accordingly, applicant submits that the Examiner has not demonstrated that the groups represent distinct and separate inventions, and for this reason the restriction requirement is respectfully traversed.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the restriction requirement, and prompt and favorable action on this application are respectfully requested. However, in the event the restriction requirement is adhered to in its entirety, applicants respectfully elect, with traverse, the invention of the Group II claims, i.e. claims 36-43 directed to methods for treating neurological disorders.

The Examiner has also stated that claims 36-43 are generic to a plurality of neuronal diseases, and requires applicant to elect a single species for examination purposes only. Pursuant to this request, applicant hereby elects Parkinson's Disease for further examination.

Accordingly, favorable consideration and early allowance of the claims of this application are solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

by William G. Gosz
William G. Gosz
Reg. No. 27,787
Ropes & Gray
One International Place
Boston, MA
Attorneys for Applicant(s)
Tel. No. (617) 951-7000

DATE: January 28, 2003